



## **Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

— *Making a positive difference through education and service* —

### **Division of Special Education Biennial Performance Report**

#### **Table of Contents**

##### **Tables**

Table 1	Performance Goals 1-9
Table 1A	Assessment Overarching Questions
Table 1B	General Assessment Performance
Table 1C	Alternate Assessment Performance
Table 2	Suspension and Expulsion
Table 3	Disproportionality

##### **Exhibit for Goals (Table 1, Goals 1-6 and 9)**

Exhibit A	Special Education District Profile
-----------	------------------------------------

##### **Exhibits for Assessment Goals (Table 1, Goals 1 and 2)**

Exhibit B1	MAP Spring 2001, State Disaggregated Totals (sample page)
Exhibit B2	MAP Achievement Level Summary Report for Mathematics (District report)
Exhibit B3	MAP-Alternate Student Report
Exhibit C1	MAP-Alternate Eligibility Checklist Supplement
Exhibit C2	MAP-Alternate Determining Student Eligibility Worksheet
Exhibit C3	Memo to Superintendents about the MAP-Alternate

##### **Exhibits for Suspension/Expulsion (Table 2)**

Exhibit D	Discipline Incidents by Disability Category
Exhibit E	Data Reported to OSEP on Number of Children with Disabilities Subject to Long-Term Suspension/Expulsion
Exhibit F	Discipline Incidents by Racial/Ethnic Category

##### **Exhibits for Disproportionality (Table 3)**

Exhibit G	Special Education and Total Enrollment by Race
Exhibit H	Disability by Race
Exhibit I	Placement by Race

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 1: *</b> The percentage of students with disabilities in Grade 3 and 7 who are proficient readers will increase, while the percentage that have the Missouri Assessment Program - Communication Arts (MAP-CA) exam read to them will decrease.													
<b>Goal 1/Indicator A:</b> None	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator A:</b> Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.												
<b>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>													
<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>2001</td></tr> <tr> <td>Reading - % Proficient – 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</td><td>15.8%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Reading - % Proficient – 7<sup>th</sup> Grade</td><td>6.9%</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Oral Accommodations Used – 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</td><td>53.9%</td></tr> <tr> <td>Oral Accommodations Used – 7<sup>th</sup> Grade</td><td>62.4%</td></tr> </table>			2001	Reading - % Proficient – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	15.8%	Reading - % Proficient – 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	6.9%			Oral Accommodations Used – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	53.9%	Oral Accommodations Used – 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	62.4%
	2001												
Reading - % Proficient – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	15.8%												
Reading - % Proficient – 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	6.9%												
Oral Accommodations Used – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	53.9%												
Oral Accommodations Used – 7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	62.4%												
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>  <b>DATA EXPLANATIONS:</b> The Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) has three reading proficiency levels – unsatisfactory, satisfactory and proficient. A student scoring in the “satisfactory” level is considered to be at grade level. The percent of third grade students with disabilities scoring at the proficient level has been increasing each year. The use of oral accommodations for the Communication Arts exam are increasing rather than decreasing. Efforts will be made to determine the underlying causes of this trend and to determine the extent and the appropriateness of the use of these accommodations.													
<b>IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:</b> <b>Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Improvement Grants (SIG) to twenty Accelerated Schools for professional development focused on reading achievement</li> <li>State Improvement Grants to the Missouri Reading Initiative for professional development focused on reading achievement</li> <li>Local Improvement Grants for Access to the General Education Curriculum (professional development grants)</li> <li>Heads-Up Reading Initiative is providing research-based training to improve early literacy through live-broadcast sessions with trained facilitators to providers to young children, birth to six years old, including teachers/ paraprofessionals/ therapists of ECSE, First Steps, and kindergarten special education teachers.</li> </ul>													
<b>Monitoring/Data Analysis:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Districts receive an annual Special Education District Profile (Exhibit A) that contains MAP reading achievement scores for students with disabilities. Both the LEAs and the Division of Special Education can use this profile to monitor for improvement and/or maintenance of a high level of performance.</li> <li>In FY 2002, Missouri began evaluating districts on performance measures in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) monitoring. Performance data becomes part of the Special Education monitoring report for each district and is entered into the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS). If district reading scores for students with disabilities are not improving, an improvement plan from the district is required.</li> <li>Each district is sent a CD-rom that contains MAP results for all students. The CD contains over 70 standard reports that the district can access. The reports detail results at State, District, School and Student levels. Several reports provide results for various disaggregate types, including students with disabilities. Results can be analyzed in a variety of ways: for all students, for students with disabilities, by teacher, etc. Districts can use this data for planning and evaluation purposes.</li> </ul>													

**Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

**Funding:**

- SIG funding for professional development (see above)

**Future Plans:**

- Continuation of monitoring procedures and funding for professional development mentioned above
- Reading First Initiative – Professional development program geared towards all K-3 teachers and K-12 Special Education teachers (application being filed)
- In FY 2003, five Access to the General Education Curriculum modules will be implemented across the state. These modules include Least Restrictive Environment, Differentiated Instruction, Collaboration and Co-teaching, Effective Practice Strategies and Curriculum-Based Measurement

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 2: *</b> The percentage of students with disabilities scoring at the Step 1 and Progressing achievement levels will decrease, while the percentage of students with disabilities scoring at the Proficient and Advanced achievement levels will increase for each of the MAP subject area assessments.			
<b>Goal 2/Indicator A:</b> None		<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 2/Indicator A:</b> Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.	
<b>Performance Data for Goal 2/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>			
<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Percent in Step 1 and Progressing</b>	<b>Percent in Advanced and Proficient</b>
Communication Arts	3	49.6	12.9
Communication Arts	7	72.4	5.3
Communication Arts	11	80.0	1.7
Health/P.E.	5	39.6	18.9
Health/P.E.	9	62.5	9.4
Mathematics	4	42.6	17.2
Mathematics	8	86.5	1.6
Mathematics	10	89.4	1.2
Science	3	31.4	27.7
Science	7	85.6	2.8
Science	10	82.4	1.4
Social Studies	4	44.5	23.7
Social Studies	8	65.1	12.7
Social Studies	11	75.5	4.3
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 2/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>  <b>DATA EXPLANATIONS:</b> Missouri has five achievement levels for the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). These levels are Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient and Advanced. Students scoring at the Nearing Proficient level are considered to be at grade level. The goal is to decrease the percentage of students scoring in the bottom two achievement levels and increase the percentage of students scoring in the top two achievement levels.			

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

### IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:

#### Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:

- o State Improvement Grant funds for professional development for teachers through the Missouri Reading Initiative, Missouri Math Project, Missouri Math Initiative and Access to the General Education Curriculum
- o MAP accommodations training
- o MAP-Alternate and Alternative Frameworks workshops

#### Monitoring/Data Analysis:

- o Districts receive an annual Special Education District Profile (Exhibit A) that contains MAP achievement scores for each subject and grade level for students with disabilities. Both the LEAs and the Division of Special Education can use this profile to monitor for improvement and/or maintenance of a high level of performance.
- o In FY 2002, Missouri began evaluating districts on performance measures in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) monitoring. Performance data becomes part of the Special Education monitoring report for each district and is entered into the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS). If district MAP scores for students with disabilities are not improving, an improvement plan from the district is required.
- o Each district is sent a CD-rom that contains MAP results for all students. The CD contains over 70 standard reports that the district can access. The reports detail results at State, District, School and Student levels. Several reports provide results for various disaggregate types, including students with disabilities. Results can be analyzed in a variety of ways: for all students, for students with disabilities, by teacher, etc. Districts can use this data for planning and evaluation purposes.

#### Funding:

- o SIG funding for professional development (see above)

#### Future Plans:

- o Continuation of monitoring procedures and funding for professional development mentioned above
- o In FY 2003, there is a proposed SIG project related to Access to the General Education Curriculum that deals with problem solving for high quality intervention for all students and all teachers statewide. This is proposed to be a pilot project using SIG funds until December 2004.
- o In FY 2003, support to teach teachers how to differentiate instruction for all students will be implemented at the Math Academy using Missouri Math Initiative SIG funds.
- o In FY 2003, five Access to the General Education Curriculum modules will be implemented across the state. These modules include Least Restrictive Environment, Differentiated Instruction, Collaboration and Co-teaching, Effective Practice Strategies and Curriculum-Based Measurement

### OSEP QUESTIONS:

**Q: Does the State have a policy that allows a parent to “exempt” their child from State or district-wide assessments?** A: No, Missouri does not have a policy that allows a parent to “exempt” their child from the MAP assessments.

**Q: When statistically sound, has the State defined performance levels for the Alternate Assessment? If not, in the Performance Targets/Benchmarks cell, indicate the schedule/timeline for completion.** A: The Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate is a portfolio assessment. The portfolio is a collection of evidence used to demonstrate student progress on the Show-Me Standards (as evidenced by the IEP goals and objectives) and the instructional supports provided to enhance learning performance. The assessment has five criteria: Progress Toward the Goal, Instructional Adaptations, Choice Making, Multiple Settings, and Integration. These criteria are scored according to data presented on data sheets and other requested documentation of evidence using descriptors for levels (categories) within each of the above criteria. Performance levels defined in relation to “Progress Toward the IEP Goals” are Insufficient Data, No Progress, Minimal Progress, Progress Evident, Clear Progress and Goal Attained. These are the levels reported in Table 1C. Missouri does not have an overall performance level for the Alternate. Therefore, there was not a statistical procedure applied.

**Q: Does a single alternate assessment represent multiple content areas, or are there separate alternate assessment for each content area?** A: In Missouri, a single alternate assessment represents multiple content areas.

**Q: How does the exclusion/exemption rate for students with disabilities compare to that for students who are nondisabled?** A: Missouri only allows for the exclusion of students with limited English proficiency who have lived in the State for less than one year. This affected approximately 10 students with disabilities in the 2000-2001 school year.

**Q: How does the State identify students with disabilities who are participating in Statewide assessments?** A: All students in the appropriate grade levels, including students with disabilities, are being accounted for in the testing process. On the MAP Student Information Form, the LEA marks if a student is an IEP Student or if the student is eligible for the MAP-Alternate.

**Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

**ASSESSMENT REPORTS/EXHIBITS:**

- Exhibit A - Special Education District Profile
- Exhibit B1 - MAP Spring 2001, State Disaggregated Totals (sample page)
- Exhibit B2 - MAP Achievement Level Summary Report for Mathematics (District report)
- Exhibit B3 - MAP-Alternate Student Report
- Exhibit C1 - MAP-Alternate Eligibility Checklist Supplement
- Exhibit C2 - MAP-Alternate Determining Student Eligibility Worksheet
- Exhibit C3 - Memo to Superintendents about the MAP-Alternate
- MAP CDs (not included) - Each district is sent a CD-rom that contains MAP results for all students. The CD contains over 70 standard reports that the district can access. The reports detail results at State, District, School and Student levels. Several reports provide results for various disaggregate types, including students with disabilities. Results can be analyzed in a variety of ways: for all students, for students with disabilities, by teacher, etc. Districts can use this data for planning and evaluation purposes.

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 3: *</b> <b>Decrease the percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school.</b>	
<b>Goal 3/Indicator A:</b> None	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 3/Indicator A:</b> Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 3/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>	
<b>Dropout Data, 2000-2001 School Year</b>	
Exit Category	Count
Received a Certificate	280
Reached Maximum Age	20
Moved, Not Known to be Continuing	814
Dropped Out	2,034
Total Dropouts	3,148
14-22 Child Count	42,291
Dropout Rate	7.4%
Data is as of 5/14/02 and excludes Department of Corrections and Division of Youth Services	
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 3/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>	
<b>DATA EXPLANATIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dropout categories include: Received a certificate; Reached maximum age; Moved, not known to be continuing; Dropped out. A certificate of attendance is available for students with disabilities who have reached maximum age and have met attendance requirements, but have not earned a diploma. These students are not considered high school graduates and are counted as dropouts.</li> <li>Dropout Rate for Students with Disabilities = Dropouts ages 14-22 / Child Count ages 14-22</li> <li>Dropout Rate for All Students = (9-12 Dropouts) / (9-12 Average Enrollment). Differences in the calculation for students with disabilities: age vs. grade, child count vs. average enrollment. Grade level and enrollment data are not available for students with disabilities.</li> </ul>	

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

### IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:

#### Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:

- State Improvement Grant funding for Positive Behavior Supports, Access to the General Education Curriculum and Transition Training
- Missouri's A+ Schools Program is a Department-wide school-improvement initiative which provides incentives for local high schools to reduce the dropout rate, raise academic expectations, provide better "career pathways" and work more closely with business and higher-education leaders. The Division of Special Education had SIG funds available to A+ schools in the 2000-2001 school year.
- The Divisions of Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational and Adult Education have a collaborative agreement to support work experience programs through the VR Co-op program and Vocational Resource Educators (VRE) located at Area Vocational Technical Schools

#### Monitoring/Data Analysis:

- Districts receive an annual Special Education District Profile (Exhibit A) that contains dropout data for students with disabilities. Both the LEAs and the Division of Special Education can use this profile to monitor for improvement and/or maintenance of a high level of performance.
- In FY 2002, Missouri began evaluating districts on performance measures in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) monitoring. Performance data becomes part of the Special Education monitoring report for each district and is entered into the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS). If district dropout rates for students with disabilities are not decreasing, an improvement plan from the district is required.

#### Funding:

- SIG funding for professional development (see above)
- State Exceptional Pupil Aid (EPA) dollars to support Vocational Resource Educators (VREs) and school district Work Experience Coordinators (WECs) to provide instruction and job site supervision for students with disabilities

#### Future Plans:

- Continuation of monitoring procedures and targeted funding for professional development to districts that have the greatest need to improve
- Training will be conducted using the "Self-Determination Through Transition" curriculum which will be expanded to include a section on both effective instructional strategies for post-school outcomes and the development of measurable transition goals and objectives
- The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation's Transition Team will conduct a 1.5 day transition institute that will focus on work experience opportunities, the Vocational Rehabilitation Co-op Program and transition assessment for educators, administrators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors
- Development of a "Risk Indicators" model which will identify the districts with the greatest need for targeted technical assistance and/or professional development



## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 4: *</b> <b>Increase the percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma.</b>	
<b>Goal 4/Indicator A:</b> None	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 4/Indicator A:</b> Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 4/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>	
<b>Graduation Data, 2000-2001 School Year</b>	
Exit Category	Count
Graduated with a Diploma	4,714
Total Dropouts	3,148
Graduation Rate	60.0%
Data is as of 5/14/02 and excludes Department of Corrections and Division of Youth Services	
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 4/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>	
<b>DATA EXPLANATIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graduates include only those students who graduated with a diploma awarded based on either total credits or on completion of the goals of the IEP. In the State of Missouri, the same diploma is awarded to both nondisabled and disabled students. There are no alternate diplomas for students with disabilities. A certificate of attendance is available for students with disabilities who have reached maximum age and have met attendance requirements, but have not earned a diploma. These students are not considered high school graduates and are counted as dropouts.</li> <li>Graduation Rate for Special Education = Graduates / (Graduates + Dropouts)</li> <li>Graduation Rate for All Students = Graduates / (Graduates + 9-12 Cohort Dropouts). Differences in the calculation for students with disabilities: 14-22 dropouts from that school year vs. 9-12 cohort dropouts</li> </ul>	
<b>IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:</b> <b>Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State Improvement Grant funding to districts for Positive Behavior Supports, Access to the General Education Curriculum and Transition Training</li> <li>Missouri's A+ Schools Program is a Department-wide school-improvement initiative which provides incentives for local high schools to reduce the dropout rate, raise academic expectations, provide better "career pathways" and work more closely with business and higher-education leaders. The Division of Special Education had SIG funds available to A+ schools in the 2000-2001 school year.</li> <li>The Department made application for the "GED Option" program in FY 2002. Districts choosing to participate will begin this program in FY 2003. Participating students will be awarded a diploma upon completion of the program.</li> <li>The Divisions of Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational and Adult Education have a collaborative agreement to support work experience programs through the VR Co-op program and Vocational Resource Educators (VRE) located at Area Vocational Technical Schools</li> </ul>	

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

**Monitoring/Data Analysis:**

- Districts receive an annual Special Education District Profile (Exhibit A) that contains graduation data for students with disabilities. Both the LEAs and the Division of Special Education can use this profile to monitor for improvement and/or maintenance of a high level of performance.
- In FY 2002, Missouri began evaluating districts on performance measures in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) monitoring. Performance data becomes part of the Special Education monitoring report for each district and is entered into the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS). If district graduation rates for students with disabilities are not increasing, an improvement plan from the district is required.

**Funding:**

- SIG funding for professional development (see above)
- State Exceptional Pupil Aid (EPA) dollars to support VREs and school district Work Experience Coordinators (WECs) to provide instruction and job site supervision for students with disabilities

**Future Plans:**

- Continuation of monitoring procedures and targeted funding for professional development for districts with the greatest need for improvement
- Training will be conducted using the Self-Determination Through Transition Curriculum which will be expanded to include a section on both effective instructional strategies for post-school outcomes and the development of measurable transition goals and objectives
- The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation's Transition Team will conduct a 1.5 day transition institute that will focus on work experience opportunities, the Vocational Rehabilitation Co-op Program and transition assessment for educators, administrators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors
- Development of a "Risk Indicators" model which will identify the districts with the greatest need for targeted technical assistance and/or professional development

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 5: *</b> Increase the performance level of children receiving Special Education services prior to age five (5) as measured by the School Entry Profile.																	
<b>Goal 5/Indicator A:</b> None	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 5/Indicator A:</b> None at this time, see explanation below.																
<b>Performance Data for Goal 5/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Readiness Scales</th><th>2000 Standard Score</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Symbolic Development</td><td>96.9</td></tr> <tr> <td>Communication</td><td>96.0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Mathematical/Physical Knowledge</td><td>95.1</td></tr> <tr> <td>Working with Others</td><td>95.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>Learning to Learn</td><td>96.0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Conventional Knowledge</td><td>97.1</td></tr> <tr> <td>Preparation for Kindergarten</td><td>96.3</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The mean standardized scale score is 100 with a standard deviation of 15. n=353</p>		Readiness Scales	2000 Standard Score	Symbolic Development	96.9	Communication	96.0	Mathematical/Physical Knowledge	95.1	Working with Others	95.5	Learning to Learn	96.0	Conventional Knowledge	97.1	Preparation for Kindergarten	96.3
Readiness Scales	2000 Standard Score																
Symbolic Development	96.9																
Communication	96.0																
Mathematical/Physical Knowledge	95.1																
Working with Others	95.5																
Learning to Learn	96.0																
Conventional Knowledge	97.1																
Preparation for Kindergarten	96.3																
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 5/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>  <b>DATA EXPLANATIONS:</b> Currently, the School Entry Profile is administered to a sampling of all kindergarteners in the state. The sampling technique is not designed to ensure a representative sample of special education students. The Division is exploring ways to either get a representative sample or to evaluate all children with disabilities as they enter kindergarten. The data reported in this Performance Report should not be considered representative and should not be used as baseline data. Targets and benchmarks will be established as more representative data becomes available.																	
<b>IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:</b> <b>Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A competency-based early intervention credential system based upon required core training and portfolio documentation for First Steps (Part C) has been established</li> <li>○ Heads-Up Reading Initiative is providing research-based training to improve early literacy through live-broadcast sessions with trained facilitators to providers to young children, birth to six years old, including teachers/ paraprofessionals/ therapists of ECSE, First Steps, and kindergarten special education teachers</li> <li>○ Funding for professional development for Access to the General Education Curriculum and Early Childhood Special Education Least Restrictive Environment</li> </ul>																	

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

**Monitoring/Data Analysis:**

- Districts receive an annual Special Education District Profile (Exhibit A) that contains early childhood child count and placement data for children with disabilities. Both the LEAs and the Division of Special Education can use this profile to monitor for improvement and/or maintenance of a high level of performance. Districts are not currently being monitored for this goal since the School Entry Profile is only administered in a random sample of districts each year.

**Funding:**

- SIG funding for professional development (see above)

**Future Plans:**

- Continuation of funding for professional development mentioned above
- Initiate a Train the Trainer module to prepare individuals to provide training to ECSE teachers and administrators across the state. Curriculum will address ECSE Least Restrictive Environment and will be funded by State Improvement Grants. The trainings will address models of service delivery for Early Childhood Special Education that provide more options for serving children in the least restrictive environment, and the process for making appropriate individualized IEP team decisions regarding placement in the LRE.
- The Division of Special Education will provide dollars to ensure that a representative sample of students with disabilities is evaluated

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 6: *</b> Maintain a vocational program participation percentage consistent with that of the general population.		
<b>Goal 6/Indicator A:</b> None		<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 6/Indicator A:</b> Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri’s Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 6/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>  Vocational Program Participation 2000-2001		
	Students with Disabilities*	All Students**
Vocational Enrollment	10,807	86,377
Population	43,225	266,358
Participation Rate	25.00%	32.43%
 * Population is Ages 14-22 Child Count ** Population is Grades 9-12 Enrollment		
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 6/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>  <b>DATA EXPLANATIONS:</b> Vocational enrollment for students with disabilities includes occupational participation as well as enrollment in a Vocational Rehabilitation Co-op Program which is a work-experience program coordinated by Vocational Rehabilitation.  Note: The enrollment numbers for Vocational Programs is a duplicated count of students if students are enrolled in more than one vocational course.  <b>IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:</b> <b>Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The Divisions of Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational and Adult Education have a collaborative agreement to support work experience programs through the VR Co-op program and Vocational Resource Educators (VRE) located at Area Vocational Technical Schools</li><li>○ State Improvement Grant funding to districts for Positive Behavior Supports, Access to the General Education Curriculum and Transition Training</li><li>○ Missouri’s A+ Schools Program is a Department-wide school-improvement initiative which provides incentives for local high schools to reduce the dropout rate, raise academic expectations, provide better “career pathways” and work more closely with business and higher-education leaders. The Division of Special Education had SIG funds available to A+ schools in the 2000-2001 school year.</li></ul>		

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

### Monitoring/Data Analysis:

- Districts receive an annual Special Education District Profile (Exhibit A) that contains vocational program participation data for students with disabilities. Both the LEAs and the Division of Special Education can use this profile to monitor for improvement and/or maintenance of a high level of performance.
- In FY 2002, Missouri began evaluating districts on performance measures in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) monitoring. Performance data becomes part of the Special Education monitoring report for each district and is entered into the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS). If district vocational program participation for students with disabilities is not satisfactory, an improvement plan from the district is required.

### Funding:

- SIG funding for professional development (see above)
- State Exceptional Pupil Aid (EPA) dollars to support VREs and school district Work Experience Coordinators (WECs) to provide instruction and job site supervision for students with disabilities

### Future Plans:

- Continuation of monitoring procedures and funding for professional development mentioned above
- DESE will implement training on Differentiating Instruction in General and Vocational Education Settings to provide effective instructional strategies to ensure the successful completion of students with disabilities in vocational programs and to facilitate increased participation of students with disabilities in vocational programs.
- Training will be conducted using the "Self-Determination Through Transition" curriculum which will be expanded to include a section on both effective instructional strategies for post-school outcomes and the development of measurable transition goals and objectives
- The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation's Transition Team will conduct a 1.5 day transition institute that will focus on work experience opportunities, the COOP Program and transition assessment for educators, administrators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 7: *</b> Increase or maintain at a high level the percentage employed or enrolled in continuing education six months post vocational training.		
<b>Goal 7/Indicator A:</b> None	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 7/Indicator A:</b> Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.	
<b>Performance Data for Goal 7/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>		
<b>Follow-up on Graduates from Vocational Programs</b>		
	2000 Graduates	
<b>Employed - Related</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>36.6%</b>
<b>Employed - Not Related</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>22.8%</b>
<b>Continuing Education - Related</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>21.2%</b>
<b>Continuing Education - Not Related</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>7.1%</b>
<b>Military - Related</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1.3%</b>
<b>Military - Not Related</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
Not Employed	101	5.1%
Not Available for Placement	48	2.4%
Status Unknown	45	2.3%
Total Follow-up	1,968	100.0%
<b>Percent Employed or in Continuing Education</b>		<b>90.1%</b>
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 7/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>		
<b>DATA EXPLANATIONS:</b> Follow-up data is reported on previous year's graduates based on the status of the graduate 180 days following exit from vocational training. The percent employed or continuing education is the sum of "Employed," "Continuing Education" and "Military," both related and not related.		

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

### IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:

#### Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:

- The Divisions of Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational and Adult Education have a collaborative agreement to support work experience programs through the VR Co-op program and Vocational Resource Educators (VRE) located at Area Vocational Technical Schools
- State Improvement Grant funding to districts for Positive Behavior Supports, Access to the General Education Curriculum and Transition Training
- Missouri's A+ Schools Program is a Department-wide school-improvement initiative which provides incentives for local high schools to reduce the dropout rate, raise academic expectations, provide better "career pathways" and work more closely with business and higher-education leaders. The Division of Special Education had SIG funds available to A+ schools in the 2000-2001 school year.

#### Monitoring/Data Analysis:

- This goal is not currently being monitored at the district level. The data and results are very similar to that of Goal 9 which is being monitored.

#### Funding:

- SIG funding for professional development (see above)
- State Exceptional Pupil Aid (EPA) dollars to support VREs and school district Work Experience Coordinators (WECs) to provide instruction and job site supervision for students with disabilities

#### Future Plans:

- Continuation of funding for professional development mentioned above
- DESE will implement training on Differentiating Instruction in General and Vocational Education Settings to provide effective instructional strategies to ensure the successful completion of students with disabilities in vocational programs and to facilitate increased participation of students with disabilities in vocational programs.
- Training will be conducted using the "Self-Determination Through Transition" curriculum which will be expanded to include a section on both effective instructional strategies for post-school outcomes and the development of measurable transition goals and objectives
- The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation's Transition Team will conduct a 1.5 day transition institute that will focus on work experience opportunities, the Vocational Rehabilitation Co-op Program and transition assessment for educators, administrators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors



### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 8: *</b> Increase the percentage receiving college preparatory certificates.	
<b>Goal 8/Indicator A:</b> No indicators	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 8/Indicator A:</b>
<b>Performance Data for Goal 8/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>	
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 8/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>  This goal has been dropped for the 2001-2002 school year. It was removed as an indicator from the Missouri School Improvement Program for all students, so the Division has removed it as a goal for students with disabilities in order to remain consistent with the goals established for all students. A new goal was established to replace this one (see Goal 9).	

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 9: *</b>		
<b>Increase or maintain at a high level the percentage employed or enrolled in continuing education six months post graduation.</b>		
<b>Goal 9/Indicator A:</b> None		<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 9/Indicator A:</b> Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 9/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b>		
<b>Follow-up on Previous Year's Graduates</b>		
	2000 Graduates	
<b>4-Year College</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
<b>2-Year College</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>16.6%</b>
<b>Non-college</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
<b>Military</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>2.6%</b>
<b>Employment</b>	<b>1,656</b>	<b>37.2%</b>
Other	392	8.8%
Total Reported	3,585	
Not Reported	866	19.5%
Total Graduates	4,451	100.0%
<b>Percent Employed or in Continuing Education</b>		<b>71.7%</b>
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 9/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>		
<b>DATA EXPLANATION:</b> Total Graduates excludes Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services, and State Board Operated Programs since they do not report follow-up on graduates.  This goal was new for the 2001-2002 school year. Follow-up data is reported on previous year's graduates based on the status of the graduate 180 days following graduation.		

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

### IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:

#### Professional Development/Trainings:

- The Divisions of Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational and Adult Education have a collaborative agreement to support work experience programs through the VR Co-op program and Vocational Resource Educators (VRE) located at Area Vocational Technical Schools
- State Improvement Grant funding to districts for Positive Behavior Supports, Access to the General Education Curriculum and Transition Training
- Missouri's A+ Schools Program is a Department-wide school-improvement initiative which provides incentives for local high schools to reduce the dropout rate, raise academic expectations, provide better "career pathways" and work more closely with business and higher-education leaders. The Division of Special Education had SIG funds available to A+ schools in the 2000-2001 school year.

#### Monitoring/Data Analysis:

- Districts receive an annual Special Education District Profile (Exhibit A) that contains post-graduation follow-up data for students with disabilities. Both the LEAs and the Division of Special Education can use this profile to monitor for improvement and/or maintenance of a high level of performance.
- In FY 2002, Missouri began evaluating districts on performance measures in conjunction with the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) monitoring. Performance data becomes part of the Special Education monitoring report for each district and is entered into the Compliance Monitoring System (CMS). If district follow-up rates for students with disabilities are not satisfactory, an improvement plan from the district is required.
- Continuing efforts are being made to improve the reporting of follow-up data in order to decrease the number of graduates for whom no follow-up is reported. Also, in the 2002-2003 school year, an additional category called "Status Unknown" will be added to the data collection instrument. This will enable the districts to account for all graduates.

#### Funding:

- SIG funding for professional development (see above)
- State Exceptional Pupil Aid (EPA) dollars to support VREs and school district Work Experience Coordinators (WECs) to provide instruction and job site supervision for students with disabilities

#### Future Plans:

- Continuation of monitoring procedures and funding for professional development mentioned above
- DESE will implement training on Differentiating Instruction in General and Vocational Education Settings to provide effective instructional strategies to ensure the successful completion of students with disabilities in vocational programs and to facilitate increased participation of students with disabilities in vocational programs.
- Training will be conducted using the "Self-Determination Through Transition" curriculum which will be expanded to include a section on both effective instructional strategies for post-school outcomes and the development of measurable transition goals and objectives
- The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation's Transition Team will conduct a 1.5 day transition institute that will focus on work experience opportunities, the Vocational Rehabilitation Co-op Program and transition assessment for educators, administrators and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors

**Enter the percentage of the total performance goals established for students with disabilities that are consistent with those for nondisabled students.      100%**

When the goals for students with disabilities were developed, the decision was made that they should be consistent with the goals for all students in Missouri. The Division has maintained 100% consistency by dropping Goal 8 (College Preparatory Certificates) when it was dropped as an indicator for all students. Goal 8 was replaced by Goal 9 because it is an important indicator of post-graduation successes and because it is a part of the Missouri School Improvement Process monitoring for all students.

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services**

**Overarching Questions**

SY: 2000-2001

Assessment Questions	Totals
<b>1. At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Table 1B, how many students with disabilities participated in the <u>general</u> assessment for the school year reported?</b> <i>(Unduplicated Count)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sum of maximum "Reportable" number for each grade level</li> </ul>	70,677
<b>2. At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Table 1C, how many students participated in the <u>alternate</u> assessment for the school year reported?</b> <i>(Unduplicated Count)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of MAP-A Portfolios received</li> </ul>	536
<b>3. At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Tables 1B and 1C, how many students were provided accommodations or modifications in either assessment measure?</b> <i>(Unduplicated Count)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The test accommodations are made up of three main types: approximately 30% are Oral Reading of Assessment, 30% are Testing with Small Group and 25% are Extended Time or Extra Testing Sessions</li> </ul>	50,842
<b>4. Do the totals shown for questions 1 and 2 include all students who were provided accommodations or modifications in the assessment? If yes, enter a zero in the cell to the right. If no, provide the number of students who were provided accommodations or modifications in the assessments and were <u>not</u> included Table 1B or Table 1C.</b> <i>(Unduplicated Count)</i>	0

Assessment Questions	Totals
<p>5. <b>At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Tables 1B and 1C, did <u>ALL</u> students with disabilities participate in at least one assessment measure? If yes, enter a zero in the cell to the right. If no, enter, in the cell to the right, the total number of students who did not participate.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Level Not Determined less MAP-A Portfolios received</li> </ul> <p><b>If a total is entered in the cell to the right, what is the State's plan for including the participation of these students in future assessments?</b></p> <p><b>Response</b> (If applicable):</p> <p>"Accountable" refers to the number of students in a given grade level that are to be tested. "Reportable" refers to the number of test booklets that were received and from which a valid score could be determined. "Level Not Determined" is the difference between Accountable and Reportable and includes any students who are eligible to take the MAP-Alternate exam. The number shown here is Level Not Determined less the number of MAP-A portfolios received. A breakdown of the reasons that students are in Level Not Determined follows (Note: A student could be eligible to take two exams in a certain grade level – ie. Third grade Communication Arts and Science. A student could fall into Level Not Determined for neither, one or both exams. The following breakdowns are based on the <b>reasons</b> that a test result is Level Not Determined, not the number of students who receive one or more results of Level Not Determined.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Less than half a percent – Students exempt from testing due to Limited English Proficiency who have been living in the State for less than one year</li> <li>○ 25-30% - Students eligible to take the MAP-Alternate exam. Guidelines for the MAP-A state that students should take the MAP-A at ages 9, 13 and 17, therefore not all students listed as MAP-A eligible would actually submit a portfolio.</li> <li>○ 35-40% - Students absent for one or more of the testing sessions</li> <li>○ 25-30% - No valid attempt for one or more of the testing sessions</li> <li>○ 2-5% - Exam was invalidated by the teacher (cheating, etc.)</li> </ul> <p>Future monitoring activities will look into Level Not Determined numbers at the district level. The Division will also be comparing the MAP numbers to other data sources in order to verify that all students with disabilities are being tested.</p>	<p>3,050</p>

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on General Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

General Assessment											
Grade X	Age	Content Area: COMMUNICATION ARTS					Content Area: MATHEMATICS				
		Step 1 Proficiency Level	Progressing Proficiency Level	Nearing Proficient Proficiency Level	Proficient Proficiency Level	Advanced Proficiency Level	Step 1 Proficiency Level	Progressing Proficiency Level	Nearing Proficient Proficiency Level	Proficient Proficiency Level	Advanced Proficiency Level
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed
1	6 Yrs										
2	7 Yrs										
3	8 Yrs	1,551	3,289	3,648	1,242	20					
4	9 Yrs						1,065	3,444	4,261	1,560	259
5	10 Yrs										
6	11 Yrs										
7	12 Yrs	3,851	3,301	2,205	518	5					
8	13 Yrs						5,128	2,945	1,113	142	8
9	14 Yrs										
10	15 Yrs						4,126	1,874	633	76	4
11	16 Yrs	2,727	1,264	915	83	1					
12	17 + Yrs										

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on General Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

General Assessment											
Grade X	Age	Content Area: SCIENCE					Content Area: SOCIAL STUDIES				
		Step 1 Proficiency Level	Progressing Proficiency Level	Nearing Proficient Proficiency Level	Proficient Proficiency Level	Advanced Proficiency Level	Step 1 Proficiency Level	Progressing Proficiency Level	Nearing Proficient Proficiency Level	Proficient Proficiency Level	Advanced Proficiency Level
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed
1	6 Yrs										
2	7 Yrs										
3	8 Yrs	946	2,116	3,991	2,249	455					
4	9 Yrs						1,600	3,112	3,358	1,903	607
5	10 Yrs										
6	11 Yrs										
7	12 Yrs	4,312	4,190	1,153	257	22					
8	13 Yrs						4,237	1,845	2,074	1,029	161
9	14 Yrs										
10	15 Yrs	3,124	2,378	1,077	70	25					
11	16 Yrs						2,812	1,057	1,037	164	57
12	17 + Yrs										

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on General Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

General Assessment											
Grade __X__	Age _____	Content Area: HEALTH / PHYSICAL EDUCATION					Content Area: READING				
		Step 1 Proficiency Level	Progressing Proficiency Level	Nearing Proficient Proficiency Level	Proficient Proficiency Level	Advanced Proficiency Level	Un- satisfactory Proficiency Level	Satisfactory Proficiency Level	Proficient Proficiency Level		
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed		
1	6 Yrs										
2	7 Yrs										
3	8 Yrs						4,285	3,925	1,540		
4	9 Yrs										
5	10 Yrs	845	3,339	4,375	1,751	245					
6	11 Yrs										
7	12 Yrs						7,000	2,197	683		
8	13 Yrs										
9	14 Yrs	3,058	2,351	2,436	749	62					
10	15 Yrs										
11	16 Yrs										
12	17 + Yrs										



**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on Alternate Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

Alternate Assessment											
Grade _____	Age X ____	Content Area: A single assessment represents multiple content areas*									
		No Progress Proficiency Level	Minimal Progress Proficiency Level	Progress Evident Proficiency Level	Clear Progress Proficiency Level	Goal Attained Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level
		No. of GOALS* Assessed	No. of GOALS* Assessed	No. of GOALS* Assessed	No. of GOALS* Assessed	No. of GOALS* Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed
1	6 Yrs										
2	7 Yrs										
3	8 Yrs	3	3	10	11	26					
4	9 Yrs	17	34	63	102	232					
5	10 Yrs	3	4	7	5	15					
6	11 Yrs	0	1	2	0	0					
7	12 Yrs	1	9	17	19	38					
8	13 Yrs	24	29	66	79	197					
9	14 Yrs	1	3	12	8	39					
10	15 Yrs	0	0	0	1	2					
11	16 Yrs	9	8	10	9	37					
12	17 + Yrs	58	19	62	67	253					

\* Students who take the Missouri Assessment Program – Alternate exams are given a rating for each goal, not a single overall rating. Therefore, results are not available at a student-level. Results are reported based on the number of goals that fall into each level. MAP-A eligibility guidelines state that students turning 9, 13 or 17 years old during the IEP implementation year should submit a portfolio, therefore, depending on the dates of birth, most students participating in the MAP-A will be 8, 9, 12, 13, 16 or 17 years old. Some students at other ages submitted portfolios in order to establish baselines at the elementary, middle and high school levels.

## Biennial Performance Report Suspension and Expulsion

*Note: If Suspension and Expulsion are addressed on Table 1, Table 2 does not have to be completed. Indicate in the Performance Data row below which Goals and Indicators on Table 1 address Suspension and Expulsion.*

### Performance Data: 2000-2001

Refer to the attached Suspension and Expulsion tables

- Exhibit D - Discipline Incidents by Disability Category
- Exhibit E - Data Reported to OSEP on Table 5, Section A, Columns 3A and 3B
- Exhibit F - Discipline Incidents by Racial/Ethnic Category

### Suspension and Expulsion Performance Targets/Benchmarks:

Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.

### Explanation/Discussion for Suspension and Expulsion Data:

#### DATA EXPLANATIONS:

During the 2000-2001 school year, DESE developed a web application that is used for reporting disciplinary actions for all students. Disciplinary actions are reported on an incident level for any incident resulting in ten or more days of suspension or expulsion. From this incident-level report, the Division of Special Education reports the number of children with disabilities who received disciplinary action to OSEP. Data for both the number of incidents and the number of children subject to disciplinary action are examined in the attached tables. This data suggests that a disproportionate number of students with emotional disturbances, learning disabilities and other health impairments are committing acts that result in disciplinary actions. In addition, 32.5% of all disciplinary incidents reported were for students with disabilities, but the statewide incidence rate for Special Education was only 14.4%. This would suggest that a disproportionate number of students with disabilities are committing acts that result in disciplinary actions.

Data was also broken down by racial/ethnic categories. It appears that Black students are committing a disproportionate share of the discipline incidents. Virtually no differences were seen in the breakdown of incidents by race when comparing incidents for all students and incidents for students with disabilities.

Again, this method of collecting discipline data was new for the 2000-2001 school year. Because of this, the process of converting an incident-level database to a student-level report is still evolving. Due to these issues, the Division is still working to establish the best way to analyze and use this data. Preliminary analysis looked at a comparison among local educational agencies within the State and between the rates for students with disabilities and all students.

Comparison among school districts in Missouri:

- Only districts that reported discipline incidents for a minimum of five students with disabilities were included
- A percent of students with disabilities that had been disciplined was calculated for each district (unduplicated count of students disciplined/child count)
- A mean and standard deviation were determined
- Only three districts had a percent disciplined that was more than one standard deviation above the mean

Comparison of rates for disabled students and all students:

- Only districts that reported discipline incidents for a minimum of five students with disabilities were included
- A percent of all students disciplined that were students with disabilities was calculated for each district (unduplicated count of students with disabilities disciplined/unduplicated count of all students disciplined)
- A mean and standard deviation were determined
- Seven districts had a percent that was more than one standard deviation above the mean. Four of these districts were at 100%, suggesting that the districts did not understand that discipline incidents were to be reported for all students, not just students with disabilities.

## Biennial Performance Report Suspension and Expulsion

*Note: If Suspension and Expulsion are addressed on Table 1, Table 2 does not have to be completed. Indicate in the Performance Data row below which Goals and Indicators on Table 1 address Suspension and Expulsion.*

**IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:****Monitoring/Data Analysis:**

At this time, the Division of Special Education is continuing to determine the best way to evaluate and use the discipline data. The monitoring process will soon begin to review and analyze the suspension/expulsion data through the district's annual Special Education District Profile. Implementation of required procedures is monitored through looking at individual student files and applying the relevant standards from Document D (Discipline). Four groups of student file types are reviewed: 1) Students suspended over 10 days in a year without a disciplinary change of placement, 2) Students suspended over 10 days with a disciplinary change of placement, 3) Forty-five day alternative educational placement for students possessing drugs/weapons, and 4) Forty-five day alternative education placement ordered by a hearing officer for dangerous/violent students.

**Professional Development/Trainings/Programs:**

Districts can apply for Local Improvement Grants to support professional development activities that focus on providing positive behavior supports. The activities include participation in a six day Positive Behavioral Support Institute. The content of the institute training is about positive behavior interventions and supports at the school-wide, small group, and individual levels, and offers opportunities for assistance and team planning. The goal of the State Improvement Grant activity is reduction of behavioral incidents (including referrals to the principal); reduction of suspensions and expulsions; and improved school climate as measured by students and faculty.

## Biennial Performance Report Disproportionality

*Note: If Disproportionality is addressed on Table 1, Table 3 does not have to be completed. Indicate in the Performance Data row below which Goals and Indicators on Table 1 address Disproportionality.*

### Performance Data: 2000-2001

Refer to the attached Disproportionality Tables

- Exhibit G - Special Education and Total Enrollment by Race
- Exhibit H - Disability by Race
- Exhibit I - Placement by Race

### Disproportionality Performance Targets/Benchmarks:

Targets and benchmarks are currently being established in conjunction with Missouri's Self-Assessment process, LEA Special Education monitoring processes and the Missouri School Improvement Program.

### Explanation/Discussion for Disproportionality Data:

#### DATA EXPLANATIONS:

Special Education child count by race, disability by race and placement by race were all looked at using the "P +/- 20% of P" methodology outlined in the General Instructions for Section 3 of the Biennial Performance Report. The attached tables give the detail of this examination of data. A brief summary of the data follows:

- Special Education Child Count by Race – No over-representation in any racial/ethnic category was found. Under-representation was found for the Hispanic, Asian and Native American Indian populations. These under-representations are not considered to be significant due to the small numbers of both Special Education and all students in these racial/ethnic categories in Missouri.
- Disability by Race – For the Black students, two disability categories, Mental Retardation and Behavior Disorders, showed significant over-representation, and four disability categories showed under-representation: Speech/Language Impaired, Partially Seeing, Other Health Impaired and Early Childhood Special Education. For the Hispanic, Asian and Indian populations, numerous disability categories showed under-representation. These under-representations are not considered to be significant due to the small numbers of students in these racial/ethnic categories in Missouri. No disproportionality was seen for the White students.
- Placement by Race – For the Black population, there were several areas of over- or under-representation. The most significant (based on the number of students affected) shows over-representation of Blacks in Self-Contained settings. For the Hispanic, Asian and Indian population, numerous placement categories showed under- or over-representation. Due to the small numbers, these are not considered significant. For the White population, three placement categories, Self-contained, Separate Private and Separate Public showed under-representation.

After looking at the data on a statewide level, it was clear that the most significant areas of disproportionality were over-representation of Black students in the disability categories of Mental Retardation and Behavior Disorders and in the placement category of Self-Contained. Obviously, other areas of disproportionality exist, but most were either in racial/ethnic categories that represent less than two percent of Missouri's student population or in low-incidence disability or placement categories. Based on this, Missouri's examination of data at a district level focused on the following:

- Over-representation of Black students in Special Education
- Over-representation of Black students in the disability category Mental Retardation
- Over-representation of Black students in the disability category Behavior Disorder (Emotional Disturbance)
- Over-representation of Black students in the placement category Self-Contained (Outside regular education greater than 60%)

A determination of disproportionality was made for each of the four categories if all three of the following were found to be true:

- Statistical significance based on a z-test ( $p < 0.05$ )
- Significance based on a "P + 10% of P" criteria
- A minimum of 10 students in the category

Districts were then rank-ordered based on the number of disproportionate calls made (possible range of zero to four). The results follow:

- Six districts were found to have over-representation of black students in all four areas
- An additional eleven districts were found to have an over-representation of black students in three of the four areas

### Biennial Performance Report Disproportionality

*Note: If Disproportionality is addressed on Table 1, Table 3 does not have to be completed. Indicate in the Performance Data row below which Goals and Indicators on Table 1 address Disproportionality.*

- An additional twelve districts were found to have an over-representation of black students in two of the four areas
- An additional 26 districts were found to have an over-representation of black students in one of the four areas

**IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:**

At this time, the Division of Special Education is working to determine the best way to address this issue. It is not currently part of the Monitoring process, however it is expected to be incorporated into the process in the near future. During the Spring of 2003, the Division will conduct workshops for school districts that will present information on the use of data and compliance information in the management of the special education process in order to impact outcomes for students with disabilities. The sessions will cover the use and analysis of data and compliance requirements in district self-assessments, administrative program evaluations, instructional planning and Comprehensive School Improvement Plans. An analysis of disproportionality data will be one of the topics.

Preliminary data has been shared with the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process committees. Through this process, the Division will be receiving guidance on methodologies and improvement strategies.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Special Education District Profile

**Sample District**

For questions regarding this data, please call  
Special Education - Data Coordination at 573-526-0299

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
**Special Education District Profile**

**Table 1: Child Count**

	1998-1999		1999-2000		2000-2001	
	#	Inc Rate	#	Inc Rate	#	Inc Rate
Mental Retardation	71	0.57%	67	0.53%	61	0.49%
Behavior Disorders	63	0.51%	66	0.53%	76	0.60%
Speech/Language Impaired	384	3.08%	397	3.16%	372	2.96%
Physically Impaired	8	0.06%	5	0.04%	6	0.05%
Partially Seeing	5		4		5	
Blind	2	0.06%	4	0.06%	6	0.09%
Hard of Hearing	12		19		17	
Deaf	6	0.14%	7	0.21%	26	0.34%
Learning Disabilities	648	5.20%	700	5.58%	687	5.47%
Other Health Impaired	20	0.16%	33	0.26%	39	0.31%
Deaf/Blind	5	0.04%	3	0.02%	6	0.05%
Multidisabled	17	0.14%	21	0.17%	32	0.25%
Autism	18	0.14%	16	0.13%	27	0.21%
Traumatic Brain Injury	3	0.02%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Early Childhood	98		62		120	
Total (3-21+ yrs):	1360	10.91%	1404	11.19%	1480	11.78%
<b>Total (5K-21+)</b>	<b>1262</b>	<b>10.12%</b>	<b>1342</b>	<b>10.70%</b>	<b>1360</b>	<b>10.82%</b>

**Table 2A: Early Childhood Special Education Placement**

	1998-1999		1999-2000		2000-2001	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Individual ECSE	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.83%
Early Childhood Setting	98	100.00%	62	100.00%	26	21.67%
Group ECSE In Integrated Building	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	92	76.67%
Group ECSE In Segregated Building	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Combination of Multiple Settings	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.83%
Residential	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total Early Childhood:</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 2: Placement Totals (5K-22)**

	1998-1999		1999-2000		2000-2001	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Regular Class	364	28.73%	374	27.72%	706	51.68%
Resource/Itinerant	711	56.12%	780	57.82%	429	31.41%
Self-Contained	149	11.76%	164	12.16%	204	14.93%
Separate School (Private)	30	2.37%	24	1.78%	17	1.24%
Separate School (Public)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.07%
Homebound/Hospital	8	0.63%	0	0.00%	2	0.15%
Residential - Private	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.07%
State Operated Schools*	5	0.39%	7	0.52%	6	0.44%
Residential - Public*	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1267</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1349</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1366</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

\* The census totals are not included in the Child Count Totals

**Note:**

Information is taken from Scrn 11 *Special Education Placement Counts of Age of Core District*  
Incident Rate based on Total Public School Enrollment  
Table 2 - Percentages are based on Child Count Totals  
Table 2A - Percentages are based on Early Childhood Totals

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Special Education District Profile

Table 2B: Placement by Disability Category

**1998-1999 School Year**

Placement:	Regular Education Modified		Resource		Self Contained		Separate School Private & Public		Homebound		Residential Private & Public		State Operated Programs		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
MR	0	0.00%	12	16.67%	56	77.78%	3	4.17%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	1.39%	72
BD	7	11.11%	21	33.33%	16	25.40%	14	22.22%	5	7.94%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	63
S/L	11	2.86%	353	91.93%	19	4.95%	1	0.26%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	384
PI	0	0.00%	5	62.50%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8
VI	3	42.86%	3	42.86%	1	14.29%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7
HI	6	33.33%	12	66.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18
LD	332	51.23%	285	43.98%	26	4.01%	2	0.31%	3	0.46%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	648
OHI	4	20.00%	10	50.00%	6	30.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	20
D/B	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5
MD	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	7	33.33%	8	38.10%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	19.05%	21
Autism	0	0.00%	7	38.89%	9	50.00%	2	11.11%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18
TBI	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3
Total:	364	28.73%	711	56.12%	149	11.76%	30	2.37%	8	0.63%	0	0.00%	5	0.39%	1267

Percentages are based on Disability Totals

**1999-2000 School Year**

Placement:	Regular Education Modified		Resource		Self Contained		Separate School Private & Public		Homebound		Residential Private & Public		State Operated Programs		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
MR	1	1.45%	10	14.49%	54	78.26%	2	2.90%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	2.90%	69
BD	14	21.21%	13	19.70%	27	40.91%	12	18.18%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	66
S/L	18	4.53%	358	90.18%	21	5.29%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	397
PI	0	0.00%	2	40.00%	2	40.00%	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5
VI	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8
HI	10	38.46%	15	57.69%	1	3.85%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	26
LD	318	45.43%	361	51.57%	21	3.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	700
OHI	6	18.18%	14	42.42%	12	36.36%	1	3.03%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	33
D/B	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3
MD	1	4.00%	1	4.00%	13	52.00%	6	24.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	16.00%	25
Autism	1	5.88%	4	23.53%	9	52.94%	2	11.76%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	5.88%	17
TBI	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
Total:	374	27.72%	780	57.82%	164	12.16%	24	1.78%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	0.52%	1349

Percentages are based on Disability Totals



## Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

## Special Education District Profile

Table 2B: Placement by Disability Category (continued)

2000 - 2001 School Year

Placement:	Regular Education Modified		Resource		Self Contained		Separate School Private & Public		Homebound		Residential Private & Public		State Operated Programs		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
MR	3	4.76%	6	9.52%	51	80.95%	1	1.59%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	3.17%	63
BD	18	23.68%	12	15.79%	35	46.05%	8	10.53%	2	2.63%	1	1.32%	0	0.00%	76
S/L	199	53.49%	155	41.67%	16	4.30%	2	0.54%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	372
PI	3	50.00%	1	16.67%	2	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6
VI	7	63.64%	2	18.18%	2	18.18%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	11
HI	18	41.86%	18	41.86%	7	16.28%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	43
LD	438	63.76%	216	31.44%	32	4.66%	1	0.15%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	687
OHI	16	41.03%	8	20.51%	15	38.46%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	39
D/B	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6
MD	0	0.00%	1	2.86%	27	77.14%	4	11.43%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	8.57%	35
Autism	4	14.29%	10	35.71%	11	39.29%	2	7.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	3.57%	28
TBI	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
Total:	706	51.68%	429	31.41%	204	14.93%	18	1.32%	2	0.15%	1	0.07%	6	0.44%	1366

Percentages are based on Disability Totals

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
**Special Education District Profile**

**Table 3: Reading Achievement (IEP)**

	1999		2000		2001	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
3rd grade reading Proficiency	14	13.6%	35	29.4%	29	27.1%
7th grade reading Proficiency	9	13.2%	12	14.8%	15	13.2%
3rd grade CA assessment read	36	35.0%	49	41.2%	38	35.5%
7th grade CA assessment read	1	55.9%	1	74.1%	79	69.3%

**Table 3A: MAP (IEP) Reading Index**

	1999	2000	2001
	#	#	#
3rd grade reading Proficiency	168.0	196.6	203.7
7th grade reading Proficiency	147.1	161.7	158.8

**Table 4: Missouri Assessment Program - Grade 3 or 4 (IEP)**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
<b>Math (Grade 4)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	*	31.5%	30.3%	21.0%	39.2%
Step 1 and Progressing	*	20.7%	28.1%	26.0%	14.7%
<b>Communication Arts (Grade 3)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	*	11.7%	21.8%	25.2%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	*	49.5%	33.6%	29.9%
<b>Science (Grade 3)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	*	13.6%	36.4%	41.2%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	*	22.3%	11.6%	16.7%
<b>Social Studies (Grade 4)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	N/A	*	20.8%	48.5%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	N/A	*	36.8%	23.8%

**Table 4A: MAP Performance Index - Grade 3 or 4 (IEP)**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
<b>Math (Grade 4)</b>	*	207.1	205.1	198.0	215.7
<b>Communication Arts (Grade 3)</b>	N/A	*	174.8	192.4	197.2
<b>Science (Grade 3)</b>	N/A	*	193.7	214.0	215.2
<b>Social Studies (Grade 4)</b>	N/A	N/A	*	190.1	219.3

**Notes:**

\* Voluntary year for the MAP

A "0" means no students with disabilities scored at that level.

N/A - No assessment available

NS - No students with disabilities took the assessment at this level.

Information is obtained from MAP Assessment.

MAP Data taken from ClearAccess 9/28/01

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
**Special Education District Profile**

**Table 5: Missouri Assessment Program - Grade 7 or 8 (IEP)**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
<b>Math (Grade 8)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	*	1.8%	1.4%	0.0%	2.3%
Step 1 and Progressing	*	85.5%	85.7%	91.9%	79.5%
<b>Communication Arts (Grade 7)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	*	8.8%	9.9%	9.6%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	*	60.3%	54.3%	56.1%
<b>Science (Grade 7)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	*	1.3%	2.6%	7.0%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	*	82.7%	88.5%	74.6%
<b>Social Studies (Grade 8)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	N/A	*	18.0%	19.3%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	N/A	*	49.2%	44.3%

**Table 6: Missouri Assessment Program - Grade 10 or 11 (IEP)**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
<b>Math (Grade 10)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
Step 1 and Progressing	*	88.9%	100.0%	95.3%	77.4%
<b>Communication Arts (Grade 11)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	*	3.0%	0.0%	5.0%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	*	57.6%	71.4%	57.5%
<b>Science (Grade 10)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	*	0.0%	2.2%	3.6%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	*	78.9%	76.1%	60.0%
<b>Social Studies (Grade 11)</b>					
Advanced and Proficient	N/A	N/A	*	4.2%	5.4%
Step 1 and Progressing	N/A	N/A	*	77.1%	59.5%

**Table 5A: MAP Performance Index - Grade 7 or 8 (IEP)**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
<b>Math (Grade 8)</b>					
	*	131.8	131.4	133.9	148.9
<b>Communication Arts (Grade 7)</b>					
	N/A	*	161.0	170.4	164.9
<b>Science (Grade 7)</b>					
	N/A	*	144.0	140.4	151.3
<b>Social Studies (Grade 8)</b>					
	N/A	N/A	*	169.7	177.8

**Table 6A: MAP Performance Index - Grade 10 or 11 (IEP)**

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
<b>Math (Grade 10)</b>					
	*	125.0	111.1	124.4	144.3
<b>Communication Arts (Grade 11)</b>					
	N/A	*	154.5	144.9	153.8
<b>Science (Grade 10)</b>					
	N/A	*	148.1	151.1	165.5
<b>Social Studies (Grade 11)</b>					
	N/A	N/A	*	137.5	151.4

**Notes:**

\* Voluntary year for the MAP

A "0" means no students with disabilities scored at that level.

N/A - No assessment available

NS - No students with disabilities took the assessment at this level.

Information is obtained from MAP Assessment.

MAP Data taken from ClearAccess 9/28/01

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
**Special Education District Profile**

**Table 7: Graduation of Students with Disabilities**

	1999	2000	2001
Number of students with disabilities who graduated	20	55	60
Graduation Rate for students with disabilities	57.14%	83.33%	81.08%

Data from screen 12 as of 9/01

**Table 8: Percent of Students dropping out**

	1999	2000	2001
Number of students with disabilities ages 14 - 22	357	392	411
Number of students with disabilities who dropped out	15	11	14
Dropout Rate for students with disabilities	4.20%	2.81%	3.41%

Data from screen 12 as of 9/01

**Table 9: Participation of Students with Disabilities in Vocational Programs**

	1999	2000	2001
Number of students with disabilities in Occupational Training	2	12	4
Number of students with disabilities in Vocational Rehabilitation Co-op programs	50	50	50
Total number of students with disabilities in vocational programs	52	62	54
General Population in Occupational Training	342	324	312

Data as of 9/20/01

**Table 10: Follow up on Previous Year's Graduates (IEP)**

	1999 Graduates		2000 Graduates	
	Disabled		Disabled	
	#	%	#	%
4 - Year College	7	14.89%	11	20.00%
2 - Year College	12	25.53%	8	14.55%
Non - College	1	2.13%	13	23.64%
Military	0	0.00%	1	1.82%
Employment	20	42.55%	17	30.91%
Other	7	14.89%	5	9.09%
<b>Total:</b>	47		55	
Percent of graduates with disabilities (Table 7) with reported follow-up		235.00%		100.00%

Data from screen 8 as of 9/11/01

**Note:**

Information is taken from Screens 8 and 12 from Core Data, Vocational and Adult Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation Coop Agreements  
 Graduation Rate: Number of graduates/  
 (number of graduates + number of dropouts.)  
 Dropout Rate: # of Dropouts/ Total Child Count Ages 14-22  
 Number of students with disabilities in Vocational Rehabilitation Co-op programs is the average of potential students for that district.

**Missouri Assessment Program-Spring 2001  
State Disaggregated Totals  
Percent of Students by Achievement Level**

Spring 2001 MAP Data -- Disaggregated -- Missouri Totals													
Content Area	Grade	Disaggregate	Reportable	Adv#	Adv%	Prof#	Prof%	Near Prof#	Near Prof %	Prog#	Prog%	Step 1#	Step1%
Communication Arts	03	Female	34210	460	1.3	11711	34.2	13341	39.0	6492	19.0	2206	6.4
		Male	36111	257	0.7	9824	27.2	14636	40.5	8343	23.1	3051	8.4
		No Response	223	0	0.0	31	13.9	82	36.8	60	26.9	50	22.4
		American Indian	198	2	1.0	44	22.2	89	44.9	46	23.2	17	8.6
		Asian	643	12	1.9	239	37.2	238	37.0	112	17.4	42	6.5
		Black(not Hispanic)	13202	32	0.2	1934	14.6	4690	35.5	4252	32.2	2294	17.4
		Hispanic	1378	1	0.1	261	18.9	563	40.9	377	27.4	176	12.8
		No Response	1074	7	0.7	303	28.2	442	41.2	237	22.1	85	7.9
		Other	419	5	1.2	107	25.5	184	43.9	89	21.2	34	8.1
		Pacific Islander	90	1	1.1	27	30.0	43	47.8	13	14.4	6	6.7
		White(not Hispanic)	53540	657	1.2	18651	34.8	21810	40.7	9769	18.2	2653	5.0
		Gifted	2879	235	8.2	2304	80.0	313	10.9	25	0.9	2	0.1
		High School Voc	9	0	0.0	4	44.4	2	22.2	2	22.2	1	11.1
		IAP(504)Students	303	0	0.0	49	16.2	142	46.9	91	30.0	21	6.9
		IEP Students	9750	20	0.2	1242	12.7	3647	37.4	3290	33.7	1551	15.9
		In Building < 1 year	6855	33	0.5	1474	21.5	2695	39.3	1818	26.5	835	12.2
		In District >=18 mo.	34601	371	1.1	10815	31.3	13849	40.0	7091	20.5	2475	7.2
		In District < 1 year	5933	29	0.5	1326	22.3	2427	40.9	1508	25.4	643	10.8
		LEP 2nd/3rd yr	382	1	0.3	31	8.1	117	30.6	135	35.3	98	25.7
		LEP Students	486	2	0.4	51	10.5	138	28.4	164	33.7	131	27.0
		Free/Reduced Lunch	20377	67	0.3	3774	18.5	7959	39.1	5911	29.0	2666	13.1
		Migrant	87	0	0.0	8	9.2	25	28.7	31	35.6	23	26.4
		Modified Admin	4943	7	0.1	455	9.2	1836	37.1	1810	36.6	835	16.9
		Non IEP Students	60794	697	1.1	20324	33.4	24412	40.2	11605	19.1	3756	6.2
		Title I	23312	110	0.5	4149	17.8	8772	37.6	7166	30.7	3115	13.4
		Voc. Concentrator	6	0	0.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.3	1	16.7
Communication Arts	07	Female	32935	938	2.8	12632	38.4	10362	31.5	5761	17.5	3242	9.8
		Male	34614	418	1.2	9205	26.6	10746	31.0	8273	23.9	5972	17.3
		No Response	420	2	0.5	78	18.6	112	26.7	97	23.1	131	31.2



**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**  
**Missouri Assessment Program**  
**MAP Achievement Level Summary Report**  
**Mathematics**

Report Number: MAP-0001		Grade	Year	Accountable	Reportable	LND	LND%	%Step1	%Prog	%NP	%Prof	%Adv	%Bot2	%Top2	MAP Index*
<b>State</b>															
		04	1997	43,151	42,120	1,031	2.40	4.70	24.60	36.50	25.30	8.80	29.30	34.10	204.5
		04	1998	67,836	65,339	2,497	3.70	3.60	21.50	43.00	26.60	5.30	25.10	31.80	204.2
		04	1999	69,573	68,404	1,169	1.70	3.20	18.90	42.60	28.90	6.40	22.10	35.30	208.2
		04	2000	70,652	69,554	1,098	1.60	3.00	19.30	41.00	28.70	8.00	22.30	36.70	209.7
		04	2001	71,529	70,748	781	1.10	2.60	17.80	41.90	29.40	8.20	20.40	37.70	211.4
		08	1997	40,859	38,785	2,074	5.10	26.40	33.80	26.30	12.10	1.30	60.20	13.50	164.1
		08	1998	67,324	62,952	4,372	6.50	24.30	35.40	27.80	11.50	1.10	59.60	12.60	164.9
		08	1999	69,708	67,220	2,488	3.60	22.40	38.10	29.10	9.70	0.60	60.50	10.40	164.0
		08	2000	69,559	67,527	2,032	2.90	23.00	34.10	28.80	12.80	1.20	57.10	14.10	167.6
		08	2001	68,491	67,167	1,324	1.90	20.90	33.50	30.90	13.40	1.40	54.40	14.70	170.4
		10	1997	33,557	31,127	2,430	7.20	34.60	31.40	22.50	10.20	1.20	66.10	11.40	155.9
		10	1998	60,625	54,744	5,881	9.70	29.70	35.30	28.00	6.80	0.20	65.00	6.90	156.2
		10	1999	63,315	59,440	3,875	6.10	27.50	34.40	28.40	9.20	0.50	61.90	9.70	160.5
		10	2000	62,900	59,979	2,921	4.60	26.30	33.70	29.60	9.90	0.40	60.00	10.30	162.2
		10	2001	64,850	62,891	1,959	3.00	22.90	33.90	30.50	11.80	1.00	56.80	12.70	167.0
<b>District</b>	<b>ENGLE R-X</b>														
		04	1998	222	220	2	0.90	3.20	20.00	50.50	22.70	3.60	23.20	26.40	201.8
		04	1999	255	253	2	0.80	0.80	12.30	49.00	32.00	5.90	13.00	37.90	215.0
		04	2000	253	253	0	0.00	1.20	17.00	42.70	32.80	6.30	18.20	39.10	213.0
		04	2001	244	244	0	0.00	2.50	16.40	46.30	27.00	7.80	18.90	34.80	210.7
		08	1997	54	50	4	7.40	26.00	36.00	30.00	8.00	0.00	62.00	8.00	160.0
		08	1998	241	232	9	3.70	25.90	45.70	22.80	5.60	0.00	71.60	5.60	154.1
		08	1999	236	230	6	2.50	23.00	42.20	30.00	4.80	0.00	65.20	4.80	158.3
		08	2000	214	210	4	1.90	14.80	42.90	35.20	7.10	0.00	57.60	7.10	167.4

LND = Level Not Determined; Prog = Progressing; NP = Nearing Proficiency; Prof = Proficient; Adv = Advanced;  
 Bot2 = Percent of Students Scoring Step1 or Progressing; Top2 = Percent of Students Scoring Advanced or Proficient  
 MAP Index\* = (pct Step 1\*1)+(pct Progressing\*1.5)+(pct Nearing Proficient\*2)+(pct Proficient\*2.5)+(pct Advanced\*3)

Data as of August 2001



**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**  
**Missouri Assessment Program**  
**MAP Achievement Level Summary Report**  
**Mathematics**

Report Number: MAP-0001		Grade	Year	Accountable	Reportable	LND	LND%	%Step1	%Prog	%NP	%Prof	%Adv	%Bot2	%Top2	MAP Index*
		08	2001	224	222	2	0.90	12.20	42.80	38.70	6.30	0.00	55.00	6.30	169.6
		10	1998	223	215	8	3.60	37.70	38.60	19.50	4.20	0.00	76.30	4.20	145.1
		10	1999	240	237	3	1.30	31.60	32.90	24.50	10.50	0.40	64.60	11.00	157.6
		10	2000	211	208	3	1.40	29.30	35.60	29.30	5.30	0.50	64.90	5.80	156.0
		10	2001	224	224	0	0.00	23.70	37.90	29.00	9.40	0.00	61.60	9.40	162.1
<b>School</b>															
4040	ROY ELEM	04	1998	100	100	0	0.00	2.00	23.00	56.00	18.00	1.00	25.00	19.00	196.5
4040	ROY ELEM	04	1999	115	114	1	0.90	0.00	13.20	54.40	28.10	4.40	13.20	32.50	211.8
4040	ROY ELEM	04	2000	110	110	0	0.00	0.00	20.00	48.20	24.50	7.30	20.00	31.80	209.5
4040	ROY ELEM	04	2001	104	104	0	0.00	1.00	11.50	45.20	30.80	11.50	12.50	42.30	220.2
4020	HELEN ELEM	04	1998	122	120	2	1.60	4.20	17.50	45.80	26.70	5.80	21.70	32.50	206.3
4020	HELEN ELEM	04	1999	140	139	1	0.70	1.40	11.50	44.60	35.30	7.20	12.90	42.40	217.6
4020	HELEN ELEM	04	2000	143	143	0	0.00	2.10	14.70	38.50	39.20	5.60	16.80	44.80	215.7
4020	HELEN ELEM	04	2001	140	140	0	0.00	3.60	20.00	47.10	24.30	5.00	23.60	29.30	203.6
3000	ANDREW MIDDLE	08	1997	54	50	4	7.40	26.00	36.00	30.00	8.00	0.00	62.00	8.00	160.0
3000	ANDREW MIDDLE	08	1998	241	232	9	3.70	25.90	45.70	22.80	5.60	0.00	71.60	5.60	154.1
3000	ANDREW MIDDLE	08	1999	236	230	6	2.50	23.00	42.20	30.00	4.80	0.00	65.20	4.80	158.3
3000	ANDREW MIDDLE	08	2000	214	210	4	1.90	14.80	42.90	35.20	7.10	0.00	57.60	7.10	167.4
3000	ANDREW MIDDLE	08	2001	224	222	2	0.90	12.20	42.80	38.70	6.30	0.00	55.00	6.30	169.6
1050	GREGORY HIGH	10	1998	223	215	8	3.60	37.70	38.60	19.50	4.20	0.00	76.30	4.20	145.1
1050	GREGORY HIGH	10	1999	240	237	3	1.30	31.60	32.90	24.50	10.50	0.40	64.60	11.00	157.6
1050	GREGORY HIGH	10	2000	211	208	3	1.40	29.30	35.60	29.30	5.30	0.50	64.90	5.80	156.0
1050	GREGORY HIGH	10	2001	224	224	0	0.00	23.70	37.90	29.00	9.40	0.00	61.60	9.40	162.1

LND = Level Not Determined; Prog = Progressing; NP = Nearing Proficiency; Prof = Proficient; Adv = Advanced;  
 Bot2 = Percent of Students Scoring Step1 or Progressing; Top2 = Percent of Students Scoring Advanced or Proficient  
 MAP Index\* = (pct Step 1\*1)+(pct Progressing\*1.5)+(pct Nearing Proficient\*2)+(pct Proficient\*2.5)+(pct Advanced\*3)

Data as of August 2001

<b><i>Missouri Assessment Program Alternate</i></b>
<b>Student Report 2001</b>
Date of Birth: IEP Begin Date:
<b>Purpose:</b> This report provides information about performance on the Missouri Assessment Program Alternate (MAP-A). It describes performance on five criteria. It is used for instructional planning, as a point of reference during Individualized Educational Program meetings, and for permanent-record keeping.
District Code:  District Name:  School Code:  School Name:  Portfolio Contact:  Portfolio ID:
District of Residence: School of Residence:

Student Results				
	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Progress Toward IEP Goals	Goal Attained	Clear Progress	Goal Attained	Goal Attained
Instructional Adaptations	Instructional Adaptations Present	Instructional Adaptations Present	Instructional Adaptations Present	No Instructional Adaptations Present
Choice Making	Choices Provided			
Multiple Settings	Another Classroom On School Grounds			
Integration	Integrated with Peer Group			

Percent of Missouri Students Scoring at Each Category						
Progress Toward IEP Goals	Insufficient	No Progress	Minimal Progress	Progress Evident	Clear Progress	Goal Attained
	20.7%	5.7%	5.4%	12.3%	14.8%	41.1%
Instructional Adaptations	Insufficient		No Adaptations		Adaptations	
	2.2%		33.1%		64.8%	
Choice Making	Insufficient		No Choices		Choices Provided	
	16.7%		1.9%		81.4%	
Multiple Settings	Insufficient	IEP Deemed Inappropriate	Another Classroom	On School Grounds	In the Community	In the Home
	6.2%	0.4%	71.5%	65.3%	74.2%	12.1%
Integration	Insufficient		IEP Deemed Inappropriate		Interaction	Integration
	13.1%		16.5%		11.4%	59.0%



## **Eligibility Checklist Supplement**

Based on questions from the field, it appears additional clarification is needed for criterion number three from the MAP-A eligibility checklist: “The student’s educational program centers on the functional application of the Missouri Show-Me Standards.” The statements below may assist IEP teams in identifying students whose instructional focus is on a functional application of the Missouri Show-Me Standards.

### **Statements/Descriptors:**

1. The student’s reading ability is limited and, as such, the student acquires information primarily through other methods.
2. The student’s ability to demonstrate knowledge by writing or speaking is limited; thus, the student must often use other methods to express ideas and share information.
3. The student requires significant supports to access the general-education curriculum while demonstrating modest progress in that curriculum.
4. The student typically has difficulty solving novel problems or using newly acquired skills in differing situations.
5. The student’s educational priorities primarily address essential skills that will be used in adult daily living.
6. The student’s post-secondary outcomes will likely require supported or assisted living.
7. The student requires instruction in small groups or on a one-to-one basis, with frequent prompts and guidance from adults.



Student Achievement

## MAP-Alternate Determining Student Eligibility Worksheet

The student meets all five of the eligibility criteria below:

Yes	No	1. The student has significant problems acquiring new skills, and acquisition of skills must be taught in very small steps.
Yes	No	2. The student does not keep pace with peers, even with the majority of students in special education with respect to the total number of skills acquired.
Yes	No	3. The student's educational program centers on the functional application of the Missouri Show-Me Standards.
Yes	No	4. The IEP team, as documented in the IEP, does not recommend participation in the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) subject areas or taking the MAP with accommodations.
Yes	No	5. The student's inability to participate in the MAP subject area assessments is not primarily the result of excessive absences; visual or auditory disabilities; or social, cultural, language or economic differences.

### Participation Matrix

IEP Implementation Date	Submission Year
December 2001	MAY 2003
January 2002	MAY 2003
February 2002	MAY 2003
March 2002	MAY 2003
April 2002	MAY 2003
May 2002	MAY 2003
June 2002	MAY 2003
July 2002	MAY 2003
August 2002	MAY 2003
September 2002	MAY 2003
October 2002	MAY 2003
November 2002	MAY 2003

Using the chart above, submit a portfolio for students turning 9, 13, or 17 years old during the IEP implementation year.

### Example:

Johnny's IEP begins in January 2002. He turns 13 in April 2002. Since Johnny turns 13 during the IEP implementation year, he will participate in the May 2003 submission of the MAP-A. Johnny's teacher will begin developing the MAP-A portfolio at the beginning of the IEP implementation period (January 2002) through the end of the IEP implementation period.

**D. Kent King**  
Commissioner of Education



P.O. Box 480  
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0480  
<http://www.dese.state.mo.us>

## Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

— *Making a positive difference through education and service* —

January 9, 2002

Dear Superintendent:

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that all students participate in the statewide assessment program. The MAP Alternate (MAP-A) is required for students with disabilities who are unable to participate in the standard statewide assessment. It is anticipated that no more than 1% to 2% of the student population will be eligible to participate in the MAP-A.

Enclosed you will find an eligibility checklist/supplement and information on upcoming MAP-A workshops. The Special Education Director will receive a MAP-A Student Information Sheet for the 2003 submission. The eligibility checklist/supplement is provided for IEP teams as a guide for determining participation in the MAP-A. A Student Information Sheet must be completed for each student participating in the May 2003 submission of the MAP-A. Additional Student Information Sheets can be obtained from the Assessment Resource Center contact below. Do not submit photocopied Student Information Sheets.

The **district of residence** will submit the Student Information Sheets for eligible students attending State Board Operated Programs: State School for the Severely Handicapped, Missouri School for the Blind and Missouri School for the Deaf. **This is a change from previous years.** The district of residence will need to work with these schools to ensure the appropriate students are enrolled in the MAP-A. The student's IEP will indicate the age at which the student will participate in the MAP-A. To ensure appropriate reporting of district results, as well as the results for the State Board Operated Programs, it is very important that the information on the Student Information Sheet is complete and accurate. This is particularly important for the fields "District of Attendance" and "District of Residence."

The Student Information Sheets must be completed using a #2 pencil. Submit the completed Student Information Sheets to: **Assessment Resource Center (ARC), 2800 Maguire Boulevard, Columbia, MO 65211, no later than January 30, 2002.** Blank portfolios will be sent upon receipt of the Student Information Sheets.

For questions concerning MAP-A enrollment, materials, or portfolio development, the contact person is:

***Dawn Maddox: (800) 845-3545 or [dmaddox1@mail.dese.state.mo.us](mailto:dmaddox1@mail.dese.state.mo.us)***

For questions concerning MAP-A eligibility, accommodations or how to implement the portfolio, the contact person is:

***Karen Allan: (573) 751-0625 or [khare\\_alla@mail.dese.state.mo.us](mailto:khare_alla@mail.dese.state.mo.us)***

For additional Student Information Sheets, the ARC contact is:

***Gordon Benson: (800) 366-8232 or [bensong@missouri.edu](mailto:bensong@missouri.edu)***

Sincerely,

Dawn Maddox, Assistant Director  
Missouri Assessment Program

Enclosures

c: Special Education Director  
Regional Facilitators  
Jim Friedebach  
Melodie Friedebach  
Gordon Benson

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education  
Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Data for Table 2 - Suspension and Expulsion**

**Discipline Incidents by Disability Category  
2000-2001 School Year**

Disability Category	Number of Discipline Incidents	Percent of All Incidents	Percent of Incidents for Disabled	Percent of Child Count
NONDISABLED	2,991	67.5%		
Mental Retardation	58	1.3%	4.0%	9.1%
<b>Behavior Disorders</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
Speech/Language Impaired	36	0.8%	2.5%	20.7%
Physically Impaired	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Partially Seeing	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Blind	2	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Hard of Hearing	3	0.1%	0.2%	0.6%
Deaf	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>Learning Disabilities</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	<b>56.8%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>
<b>Other Health Impaired</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>
Deaf-Blind	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Multidisabled	13	0.3%	0.9%	0.7%
Autism	9	0.2%	0.6%	1.3%
Traumatic Brain Injury	1	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Early Childhood Special Ed.	1	0.0%	0.1%	5.8%
Total for Students with Disabilities	1,441	32.5%	100.0%	100.0%
Total for All Students	4,432	100.0%		

NOTE: Data includes only suspensions and expulsions resulting in more than 10 days out of school consecutively or cumulatively.

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education  
Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Data for Table 2 - Suspension and Expulsion**

**Data reported to OSEP on Number of Children with Disabilities Subject to  
Long-Term Suspension/Expulsion**

Disability Category	OSEP Table 5, Section A, Column 3A*	Percent	OSEP Table 5, Section A, Column 3B**	Percent
Mental Retardation	40	9.8%	39	4.7%
Behavior Disorders	82	20.0%	244	29.3%
Speech/Language Impaired	12	2.9%	19	2.3%
Physically Impaired	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Partially Seeing				
Blind	2	0.5%	0	0.0%
Hard of Hearing				
Deaf	0	0.0%	2	0.2%
Learning Disabilities	237	57.8%	443	53.2%
Other Health Impaired	31	7.6%	70	8.4%
Deaf-Blind	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Multidisabled	4	1.0%	8	1.0%
Autism	2	0.5%	6	0.7%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Early Childhood Special Ed.	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Total	410	100.0%	832	100.0%

\* 3A - Number of Children Subject to Suspension/Expulsion > 10 Days

\*\* 3B - Number of Children Subject to Multiple Short-Term Suspensions  
Summing to > 10 Days

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education  
Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Data for Table 2 - Suspension and Expulsion**

**Discipline Incidents by Racial/Ethnic Category  
2000-2001 School Year**

	All Students		Students with Disabilities		
Ethnicity	Number of Discipline Incidents	Percent of Incidents	Number of Discipline Incidents	Percent of Incidents	Percent of Total Enrollment
White	2,939	66.3%	964	66.9%	79.3%
Black	1,376	31.0%	444	30.8%	17.4%
Hispanic	62	1.4%	13	0.9%	1.8%
Asian	28	0.6%	4	0.3%	1.2%
Indian	27	0.6%	16	1.1%	0.3%
Total	4,432	100.0%	1,441	100.0%	100.0%

NOTE: Data includes only suspensions and expulsions resulting in more than 10 days out of school consecutively or cumulatively.

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education  
Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Data for Table 3 - Disproportionality**

**Special Education and Total Enrollment by Race  
2000-2001 School Year**

	Number of Students in Special Education	Proportion of Special Education Enrollment	Total Number of Students	Proportion of Total Enrollment
White	101,662	78.6%	709,314	79.3%
Black	25,468	19.7%	156,042	17.4%
Hispanic	1,408	<i>1.1%</i>	16,258	1.8%
Asian	495	<i>0.4%</i>	10,392	1.2%
Indian	314	<i>0.2%</i>	2,819	0.3%
Total	129,347	100.0%	894,825	100.0%

NOTE: Percentages in italics (right) indicate under-representation according to the "P - 20% of P" criteria.

**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education  
Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Data for Table 3 - Disproportionality**

**Disability by Race  
2000-2001 School Year**

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Total
Mental Retardation	8,328	3,997	144	56	38	12,563
Behavior Disorders	6,372	2,757	69	9	22	9,229
Speech/Language Impaired	24,497	3,450	301	162	59	28,469
Physically Impaired	567	116	8	13	1	705
Partially Seeing	167	25	2	2	-	196
Blind	197	42	3	2	1	245
Hard of Hearing	638	124	11	7	2	782
Deaf	335	89	9	6	1	440
Learning Disabilities	51,574	13,392	764	177	164	66,071
Other Health Impaired	6,556	962	60	22	17	7,617
Deaf-Blind	40	9	1	-	-	50
Multidisabled	740	154	8	9	5	916
Autism	1,371	299	25	26	2	1,723
Traumatic Brain Injury	280	52	3	4	2	341
Early Childhood Special Education	6,752	1,104	108	59	13	8,036

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Total
Mental Retardation	66.3%	<b>31.8%</b>	<i>1.1%</i>	<i>0.4%</i>	0.3%	100.0%
Behavior Disorders	69.0%	<b>29.9%</b>	<i>0.7%</i>	<i>0.1%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	100.0%
Speech/Language Impaired	86.0%	<i>12.1%</i>	<i>1.1%</i>	<i>0.6%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	100.0%
Physically Impaired	80.4%	16.5%	<i>1.1%</i>	<b>1.8%</b>	<i>0.1%</i>	100.0%
Partially Seeing	85.2%	<i>12.8%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	100.0%
Blind	80.4%	17.1%	<i>1.2%</i>	<i>0.8%</i>	<b>0.4%</b>	100.0%
Hard of Hearing	81.6%	15.9%	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>0.3%</i>	100.0%
Deaf	76.1%	20.2%	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>1.4%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	100.0%
Learning Disabilities	78.1%	20.3%	<i>1.2%</i>	<i>0.3%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	100.0%
Other Health Impaired	86.1%	<i>12.6%</i>	<i>0.8%</i>	<i>0.3%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	100.0%
Deaf-Blind	80.0%	18.0%	<i>2.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	100.0%
Multidisabled	80.8%	16.8%	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>1.0%</i>	<b>0.5%</b>	100.0%
Autism	79.6%	17.4%	<i>1.5%</i>	<b>1.5%</b>	<i>0.1%</i>	100.0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	82.1%	15.2%	<i>0.9%</i>	<i>1.2%</i>	<b>0.6%</b>	100.0%
Early Childhood Special Education	84.0%	<i>13.7%</i>	<i>1.3%</i>	<i>0.7%</i>	<i>0.2%</i>	100.0%
Total Student Population	79.3%	17.4%	1.8%	1.2%	0.3%	100.0%

NOTE: Percentages in bold (left) indicate over-representation according to the "P + 20% of P" criteria.  
Percentages in italics (right) indicate under-representation according to the "P - 20% of P" criteria.



**Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Division of Special Education  
Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Data for Table 3 - Disproportionality**

**Placement by Race  
2000-2001 School Year**

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Total
Regular (<21%)	56,898	11,378	654	274	138	69,342
Resource (21% - 60%)	32,154	6,430	509	120	114	39,327
Self Contained (>60%)	9,819	6,196	195	72	51	16,333
Separate Private	415	303	10	2	-	730
Separate Public	1,832	1,066	34	25	6	2,963
Home	445	69	3	2	5	524
Residential Private	33	5	1	-	-	39
Residential Public	66	21	2	-	-	89
Total	101,662	25,468	1,408	495	314	129,347

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Total
Regular (<21%)	82.1%	16.4%	0.9%	0.4%	0.2%	100.0%
Resource (21% - 60%)	81.8%	16.4%	1.3%	0.3%	0.3%	100.0%
Self Contained (>60%)	60.1%	<b>37.9%</b>	1.2%	0.4%	0.3%	100.0%
Separate Private	56.8%	<b>41.5%</b>	1.4%	0.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Separate Public	61.8%	<b>36.0%</b>	1.1%	0.8%	0.2%	100.0%
Home	84.9%	13.2%	0.6%	0.4%	<b>1.0%</b>	100.0%
Residential Private	84.6%	12.8%	<b>2.6%</b>	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Residential Public	74.2%	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total Student Population	79.3%	17.4%	1.8%	1.2%	0.3%	100.0%

NOTE: Percentages in bold (left) indicate over-representation according to the "P + 20% of P" criteria.  
Percentages in italics (right) indicate an under-representation according to "P - 20% of P" criteria.